

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 10/14/08, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 are pending. A Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.78(a)(3) was earlier submitted and granted after the mailing date of the current office action. Applicant has included above a copy of the amendment to the specification that has been accepted by the PTO, which states that the present application is a continuation-in-part (CIP) application of Application No. 10/269,922, now U.S. Patent 7,206,879.

In the Office Action mailed 10/14/08, the Examiner has objected to the specification because it introduces new matter. The amendment entered with the renewed petition now correctly states that:

This application claims priority pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §120 as a continuation-in-part (CIP) application of Application No. 10/269,922, filed October 11, 2002, now U.S. Patent 7,206,879, issued April 17, 2007. The 10/269,922 Application claims priority pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §119(e) to U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/380,740, filed May 15, 2002; U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/331,789, filed Nov. 20, 2001; U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/344,713, filed Dec. 24, 2001; U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/348,777, filed Jan. 14, 2002; and U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No. 60/348,717, filed Jan. 14, 2002; in which all of the above-listed provisional applications are incorporated herein by reference in entirety.

Furthermore, this application is related to U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/270,016, filed October 11, 2002, now U.S. Patent 7,227,870, issued June 5, 2007; and U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/269,666, filed October 11, 2002, now U.S. Patent 6,912,602, issued June 28, 2005; each of which is incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

Accordingly, the language to incorporate by reference the 10/269,922 application has now been removed and no new matter is introduced into the present application. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the specification.

The Examiner has also objected to claims 1, 6, 10 and 15 for having informalities. Applicant has amended the claims, taking into account the Examiner's suggestions, to remove the informalities. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to remove the claim objections.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 6, 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that the various text noted by the Examiner have been corrected in the amended claims. Claims 1 and 10 now recite a first interface and a second interface that couple the first node and the second node. Furthermore, claims 6 and 15 now recite that the second bridge writes data to a location of the memory and a subsequent access by an agent to read the data in the memory conform to a producer-consumer protocol. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has also rejected pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sano et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0105828; "Sano"). Applicant submits that because the above-referenced petition has been granted, the rejection becomes moot, since priority is now established to Sano as the parent application. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) and 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections.

Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Keller et al. (U.S. Patent 6,714,994; "Keller"). In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to recite that the first node and the second node both support coherent and non-coherent traffic. Applicant submits that Keller discloses transmission of packets between processing nodes **16** within processing subsystem **12**, which is operated in a coherent fashion such that processing subsystem **12** preserves the coherency of data stored within memories **20A-20D** and the caches of processing nodes **16A-16D**. However, the transmission of packets across

communication links **26A-26C** of I/O nodes **24** are operated in a non-coherent fashion (Keller at col. 8, lines 1-16). Thus, Applicant submits that the amended claims are distinguishable from Keller, in that both first and second nodes support coherent and non-coherent traffic. This argument is repeated herein for the dependent claims as well. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection based on Keller.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-8 of U.S. patent 7,206,879. In response, Applicant is submitting a terminal disclaimer with appropriate fee to overcome the non-statutory double patenting rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the double-patenting rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and solicits the Examiner for the allowance of pending claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response or the petition, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 01/14/2009

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com